

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION N	О.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/636,081 08/06/2003		08/06/2003	Pramod K. Gupta	. 24866A	9824
28624	7590	05/18/2006		EXAMINER	
		R COMPANY ROPERTY DEPT., CH	PARA, ANNETTE H		
P.O. BOX		ROIERII DEI I., CI	1 1327	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
FEDERA	EDERAL WAY, WA 98063			1661	
				DATE MAILED: 05/18/2006	5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			$\sim$
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/636,081	GUPTA ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
·	Annette H. Para	1661	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence addi	ress
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1: after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period v Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from , cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this com D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on  2a) This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) This  3) Since this application is in condition for alloward closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro		ments is
Disposition of Claims			
4) □ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray. 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) □ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	wn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	epted or b) objected to by the I drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFF	` '
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	•		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority document: 2. Certified copies of the priority document: 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National S	tage
Attachment(s)  I) \( \sum \) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) \( \sum \) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  B) \( \sum \) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4)  Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5)  Notice of Informal P 6)  Other:	ate	152)

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1, 8, 9 remain provisionally rejected over claims 17, 18, 19, 20 and 21 of copending Application No. 10/405, 819.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Claims 1-18, and 20-21 remain rejected and newly added claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Pullman et al. (US 5,294,549 published on March 15, 1994).

Applicant's arguments filed on February 24, 2006 have been fully considered, but they are not persuasive. Applicant argue that the Pullman et al reference does not teach or suggest the cultivation of **pre-cotyledonary** embryos in a medium comprising an absorbent composition in combination with gibberellin and/or abscisic acid but rather describes the different stages of conifer embryogenesis as induction, maintenance, singulation, development and germination.

Pullman et al. teach a method of cultivation of proembryos in a medium with a pH of 5.7 (column 13 table1) comprising 88.4 mg/L-132.6 mg/L of auxin, 69.36 mg/L- 144.5 mg/L of cytokinins in combination with 0.05- 1.0% activated charcoal (column 7, lines 24-28). As explained by the applicant on page 6, paragraph 1 of the remarks, the term 'pre-cotyledonary embryos" in the instant application and "proembryos" in Pullman et al. both refer to the state of the embryonic cells prior to the development stage. Pullman et al further teach that for Loblolly pine the osmotic level should be of at least 200 mM/kg and preferably about 240 mM/kg or even higher. Moreover Pullman et al. teach the transfer of the proembryos to a development culture medium (column 7, lines 29-31).

Further applicants argue that the pre-cotyledonary embryos of the instant application are cultivated in synchronization medium after the maintenance stage and prior to the development stage, whereas,

Application/Control Number: 10/636,081

Art Unit: 1661

Pullman et al. teaches the culture of proembryos in a maintenance medium in which no hormone absorbent is usually necessary or desirable at this time.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., after the maintenance stage and prior to the development stage) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claim 19 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pullman et al. (US Patent No. 5, 294, 549 1994).

Applicant's arguments filed on February 24, 2006 have been fully considered, but they are not persuasive.

Applicants argue that the examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness because the cited reference fails to disclose or suggest all the claim elements of the claimed invention.

Pullman et al. teach that when the method for producing conifer somatic embryos is used to reproduce loblolly pine tree the osmotic level should be at least 200 mM/kg and preferably 240 mM/kg or even higher (column 7, lines 59-61). Moreover, Pullman et al. teach that these adjustments are considered to be within the routine experimental capability of those skilled in the art of tissue culture (column 13, lines 3-10). These teachings suggest all the claim elements of the claimed invention.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date

Art Unit: 1661

of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

#### **Future Correspondence**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Annette H Para whose telephone number is (571) 272-0982. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Thursday from 5:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Anne Marie Grunberg, can be reached on (571) 272-0975. The fax number for the organization where the application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application
Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from
either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through
Private PAIR only.

For more information about PAIR system, see <a href="http://pair-direct.uspto.gov">http://pair-direct.uspto.gov</a>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Annette H Para

5/10/2006

NNE KUBELIK, PH.D.